

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present Application. Claims 2 and 3 are currently amended. Claim 2 has been re-written to be in independent form, and claim 3 has been amended to depend upon claim 2 rather than claim 1. Accordingly, no new matter is being introduced into the Application by way of this amendment. Entry is respectfully requested.

Declaration and Power of Attorney

The Examiner has kindly advised the Applicants that in the previously filed Declaration, the priority box declining priority was inadvertently checked.

Applicants first note that a certified copy of the priority document has already been filed with the USPTO. Further, along with this paper, Applicants also submit a Supplemental Declaration which correctly leaves the box declining priority unchecked.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mechem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,993,127), in view of Orton (U.S. Patent No. 4,624,033). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Mechem's fixture as taught by Orton to include an engagement member, composed of an engagement portion and an operation portion.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. In the present case, it is respectfully submitted that Mechem and Orton combined do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the present claim 1.

Orton teaches a lock finger **60**, that the Examiner asserts is similar to the engagement member recited in claim 1. However, in Orton, an engagement portion of the lock finger **60**, which is engaged with the actuator button has a straight shape, and is not projected

*suggest the combination of
elements or set forth in
the claim wherein*

inside the insertion groove. This is clearly shown in Orton in Figure 4. Accordingly, ~~the lock finger 60 in~~ Orton does not have an engagement portion ~~as recited in present claim 1, which is~~ projected inside the insertion groove to form a small hole, larger than the shaft portion, and smaller than the bulging portion, along with an end portion of the insertion groove.

In addition, the finger grip cap 76 in Orton, which covers the free end of the lock finger 60, is asserted to be similar to the operation portion of the engagement member of present claim 1. However in Orton, the finger grip cap 76 is retracted inside a surface of the housing 26, as shown in Figure 1, but is not projected outward from the surface of the housing 26. Therefore, the lock finger 60 of Orton does not have the operation portion of present claim 1, which is projected outward from the main body.

Therefore, Orton fails to teach the engagement member that is recited in present claim 1, which has an engagement portion and an operation portion. Accordingly, Orton combined with Mechem fail to teach all of the elements of claim 1, and do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of present claim 1. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicates that claim 2 would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

Claim 2 has been re-written to be in independent form. In addition, claim 3 has been amended to depend upon claim 2, instead of claim 1.

An early and favorable first action on the merits for all of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By  #28380

Andrew D. Meikle
Registration No.: 32,868
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

